



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,776	06/06/2005	Tomoaki Mori	07409.0044	4882
22852	7590	04/13/2007	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			HUNTER, ALVIN A	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3711		
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	04/13/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/537,776	MORI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alvin A. Hunter	3711	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 June 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 06/06/05.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The examiner reserves the right to restriction if method claims diverges from the apparatus claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 6/06/05 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 4 requires plural head speeds however claim 3 does not recite any language that requires plural head speeds. Clarity to claim needed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Shiell et al. (USPN 6969326).

Regarding claim 1, De Shiell et al. discloses a golf club comprising a hollow golf club head which has a face portion, a crown portion connected to the face portion, and a sole portion connected to the face portion wherein a first region whose surface area constitutes 5% or more of a total surface area of the crown portion is formed by a first outer shell member in a region of the crown portion which is located along a connecting edge of the crown portion connecting to the face portion and within 50mm from the connecting edge, and a second region whose surface area constitutes 5% or more of the total surface area of the sole portion is formed by a second outer shell member in a region of the sole portion which is located along a connecting edge of the sole portion connecting to the face portion and within a distance of 50mm from the connecting edge of the sole portion wherein the first outer shell is structured by a carbon fiber reinforced plastic material (CFRP) and the second outer shell member is structured by a metal alloy. It is submitted that De Shiell et al. teaches the ratio claimed by the applicant being that Deshiell et al. gives the thicknesses of both the crown and sole in addition to the Young's Modulus of the materials used for both. If the crown has a thickness of 1mm and is made of a CFRP and the sole has a thickness of 2mm and is made of Magnesium alloy, the ratio would be less than 0.75. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have the club head made of any combination of materials so long as the COR of the club head is increased.

Regarding claims 3 and 4, see the above regarding claim 1. Further, the thickness and the Young's Modulus are already predetermined before assembling the club head. Also all club head are designed based on USGA Parameters which require the club head to be tested as particular speeds.

Regarding claim 5, every club head has a loft angle and a lie angle therefore, it is presumed that the data is set to a loft and lie angle also.

Regarding claim 6, see the above regarding claim 4. Also De Shiell et al. notes that the layers of CFRP are oriented in different angles.

Regarding claim 7 see the above regarding claims 1 and 6.

Regarding claim 8, see the above regarding claim 1. Further, regulating the ratio by head speed does not further limit the claim being that the Young's modulus and the thickness of the materials are held and used to make the ratio before anything else occurs.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alvin A. Hunter whose telephone number is 571-272-4411. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30AM to 4:00PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eugene Kim, can be reached at 571-272-4463. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AAH
Alvin A. Hunter, Jr.

Eugene Kim
EUGENE KIM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER